DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 398 JC 020 611

AUTHOR	Doucette, Don, Ed.
TITLE	Leadership Abstracts, 1993.
INSTITUTION	League for Innovation in the Community Coll.
SPONS AGENCY	Systems & Computer Technology Corp., Malvern, PA.
PUB DATE	1993-00-00
NOTE	65p.; Initial support from the WK. Kellogg Foundation. Published monthly. Issues were not published for the months of November and December of 1993. For the 1992 issues, see ED 358 885.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/leaderab_main.htm.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT	Leadership Abstracts; v6 n1-10 Jan-Oct 1993
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Finance; Faculty Development; Instructional Improvement; *Leadership Effectiveness; Leadership Responsibility; *Part Time Faculty; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This document includes 10 issues of Leadership Abstracts (volume 6, 1993), a newsletter published by the League for Innovation in the Community College (California). The featured articles are: (1) "Reinventing Government" by David T. Osborne; (2) "Community College Workforce Training Programs: Expanding the Mission to Meet Critical Needs" by Brenda M. Beckman and Don Doucette; (3) "Positioning the Community College for Community Leadership" by Edgar J. Boone and George B. Vaughan; (4) "Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning"; (5) "Catalyst for Community Change: Helping to Address Critical Issues" by Nancy LeCroy and Barbara Tedrow; (6) "Part-Time Faculty: Partners in Excellence" by John McGuire; (7) "Professional Development for Two-Way Teaching and Learning" by Nancy E. Stetson; (8) "A Community College President's Guide to Corporate Contributions" by Herrington J. Bryce; (9) "Vocational and General Education: New Relationship or Shotgun Marriage?" by James Jacobs; and (10) "What Presidents Need to Know about the Impact of Networking." (JCC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 398

Leadership Abstracts, 1993

Dan Doucette, Editor

Leadership Abstracts v6 n1-10 Jan-Oct 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. O'Banion

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

JC 020 611

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Leadership Abstracts January 1993 Volume 6, Number 1

League for Innovation in the Community College

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

David T. Osborne

An historic change is now coursing through all levels of American government: a shift from the rigid, wasteful, centralized bureaucracies of the industrial era to the more flexible, entrepreneurial, decentralized government needed to succeed in today's world. This shift, under way for more than a decade, has been brought into sharp relief by the fiscal crisis now crippling our governments.

As the 90s dawned, every government in America seemed to hit the wall at once. State governments struggled to close their largest deficits in history totaling well over $30 billion. Cities like New York struggled with billion dollar deficits. The Federal deficit ballooned toward $400 billion roughly the equivalent, in inflation adjusted dollars, of the entire Federal budget in 1965. The most frightening aspect of this fiscal melt down is that it will continue, even as the recession ends. Only part of the problem is declining revenues. A significant portion is built in spending increases, particularly in Medicaid (where spending is doubling every four years), prisons and corrections (where state spending nearly quadrupled in the 80s), and education.

This unprecedented, ongoing fiscal crisis has created a sudden urgency to do more with less. Politicians who three years ago paid no attention to management issues are now desperate for ways to save money without eliminating vital services. The voters vehemently oppose most tax increases, but they also oppose many service cuts. They want government to do more in areas from health care to education to environmental protection.

Voters don't want more government, as Democrats have traditionally offered. But they don't want less government either. They want better government and less expensive government. They are frustrated with slow, unresponsive, inefficient bureaucracies that soak up ever more tax dollars and deliver ever poorer services. Without articulating it in so many words, the American people are demanding governments that are less bureaucratic and more entrepreneurial. During the industrial era, public institutions were set up much like businesses: large, centralized bureaucracies, with elaborate rules and regulations and hierarchical chains of command. But in today's world of economic flux, fierce global competition, and sophisticated information and communications technologies, such institutions are dinosaurs. To be effective in these times, institutions (public or private) must be flexible, adaptable, and innovative. They must search constantly for new ways to improve services and heighten productivity.

Characteristics of Entrepreneurial Government

How do we get such governments? My co author, Ted Gaebler, and I spent the last five years trying to answer that question. We have visited public entrepreneurial institutions from coast to coast school districts, local governments, public housing authorities, even parts of the Pentagon. We have asked a simple question: What makes them different? What have they changed that makes their employees act so differently?

In answer, we have come up with a series of principles that define entrepreneurial government. For example, while bureaucratic governments concentrate virtually all of their attention on spending money, entrepreneurial governments also concentrate on earning money. The other principles include the following:

Catalytic Government. Traditional governments use their tax dollars primarily to create bureaucracies that deliver services: public schools, public transit systems, public welfare

departments. Caught between rising service demands and falling revenues, entrepreneurial governments increasingly act as catalysts--leveraging private sector actions to solve problems. They steer more than they row.

Community Owned Government. As they shift into more catalytic mode, entrepreneurial governments push control of many of the services out of the bureaucracy and into the community. Traditional public programs empower bureaucrats and professionals, giving police, doctors, teachers, and social workers the control, while the people they are serving have none. Doing this undermines the confidence and competence of citizens and communities. This creates dependency. Entrepreneurial public organizations empower families and communities to solve their own problems. It is simple common sense: families and communities are more committed, more caring, and more creative than professional service bureaucracies. They are also a lot cheaper.

Competitive Government. In traditional governments, monopoly is the American way. The assumption is that each neighborhood should have one school, each city should have one police force, each region should have one organization driving its buses and operating its commuter trains. When costs have to be cut, we eliminate anything that smacks of duplication - assuming that consolidation will save money.

Yet we know from painful experience that monopoly in the private sector often encourages inefficiency and inhibits change. It is an enduring paradox of American ideology that we attack private monopolies so fervently but embrace public monopolies so warmly.

Mission Driven Government. Public officials who are frustrated by their huge, rule driven bureaucracies simply go offshore, creating smaller, more entrepreneurial organizations. Those organizations are driven not by their rules but by their missions. They get rid of most of

their rules and dissolve most of their budget items. They define their fundamental missions, then develop budget systems and rules that free their employees to pursue those goals.

Results Oriented Government. Traditional public institutions focus almost exclusively on inputs. They finance schools based upon how many children enroll; welfare based upon how many poor people are eligible; police departments based upon police estimates of manpower needed to fight crime. They pay little attention to outcomes, to results. It doesn't matter how well children do in one school versus another, how many poor people get off welfare into stable jobs, how much the crime rate falls or how secure the public feels. In fact, schools, welfare departments, and police departments typically get more money when they fail: when children do poorly, welfare roles swell, or the crime rate rises. Entrepreneurial governments seek to change these incentives. They measure outcomes and reward success.

Customer Driven Government. When practical, the best way to tie spending to results is to give the resources directly to the customers the intended recipients of the service in question and let them choose a provider, based upon information about quality and price. This forces providers (job training vendors, childcare centers, landlords) to compete to offer the best deal to customers. It also gives customers a choice of services. Putting resources directly in customers' hands is hardly a radical idea. Vouchers and cash grants have been around for decades. Food stamps are vouchers. Our largest housing subsidy the mortgage interest deduction is the equivalent of a voucher. Pell grants, the primary form of Federal aid to college students, are like vouchers: their recipients can use them at any accredited college or technical school.

Decentralized Government. Sixty years ago, centralized institutions were indispensable. Information technologies were primitive, communication between locations was slow, and the public work force was relatively uneducated. In order to gather information and dispense orders

efficiently, there was little alternative but to bring all public health employees together in one hospital, all public works employees together in one organization, all bank regulators together in one or two institutions. There was plenty of time for information to flow up the chain of command and for decisions to flow back down.

But today, information is virtually limitless, communication between remote locations is instantaneous, many public employees are well educated, and conditions change with blinding speed. There is no time to wait for information to go up the chain of command and decisions to come down. Today, things work better if those laboring in public organizations schools, public housing developments, parks, training programs have the authority to make their own decisions.

Market Oriented Government. If you had set out to buy a home in 1930, you would have saved up to 50 percent of the purchase price for a down payment and applied at your local bank for a five year mortgage. That was how banks did business. During the New Deal, the Federal Housing Administration pioneered a new form of mortgage, which required only 20 percent down and let the borrower repay over 20, and later 30, years. Other government corporations created a secondary market, so banks could resell these new loans, and the banking industry converted. In pushing banks to offer a new form of mortgage, the Federal Government was restructuring the marketplace to fulfill a public purpose.

This is a powerful and economical way for governments to accomplish their goals. By finding the incentives that can leverage millions of private decisions government can often accomplish far more than it can by financing administrative programs. Think of the way some states have handled litter from bottles and cans. Rather than creating elaborate and expensive recycling programs, they have simply required buyers to pay a 5 cent deposit on each bottle or can to be refunded when the bottle or can is returned.

As the industrial era dawned, in the early decades of this century, Americans reinvented their governments. Because our economy and society have once again experienced profound and wrenching changes, we have begun to do so again. The task is not ideological; it is not about making government smaller, or weaker. The task is to make government stronger, by making it work again.

We desperately need government in the 1990s. We don't need more government, we need better government. To be more precise, we need better governance. Governance is the act of collectively solving our problems. Government is the instrument we use. The instrument is outdated, and it is time to remake it.

This issue is abstracted from the article "Government That Means Business," which was published in the New York Times Magazine, March 1, 1992. The article was adapted from Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Trans forming the Public Sector by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, published by Addison Wesley Publishing Company in February 1992. David Osborne has assisted President Clinton in speech writing on reform in government.

[Editor's note: Although this abstract focuses on governments, these principles apply to other publicly funded institutions, including community colleges. Both governments and educational institutions have similar resource constraints in the face of rising demand, and both must deal with public expectations that they help the citizenry survive and prosper in the rapidly changing economy and world.]

Guest editor, Kay McClenney, Vice President, Education Commission of the States

Leadership Abstracts February 1993 Volume 6, Number 2

League for Innovation in the Community College

COMMUNITY COLLEGE WORKFORCE TRAINING PROGRAMS: EXPANDING THE MISSION TO MEET CRITICAL NEEDS

Brenda Marshall Beckman and Don Doucette

Growing concern regarding the nation's competitive position in the global economy has been a matter of discussion for some time. It is now clear that a fundamental factor contributing to this critical situation is the chronic, long term inadequacy of workforce preparation. Consequent issues of quality and productivity have forced corporations across the country to restructure their organizations and to invest in worker training.

Due to the positive anecdotal experience of many employers in using community colleges to provide such training, there has been a growing interest in these colleges as primary sources of education and training for business and industry. Costs have been reasonable; their experience in teaching adults has helped employees to learn effectively; and their willingness to design high quality, need specific training programs on relatively short lead times have made community colleges increasingly the providers of choice. What has not been known is the extent to which this has occurred nationwide.

In response to the need for more information about workforce training programs, the League for Innovation conducted a survey in the fall of 1992. Its purpose was to determine the extent and nature of community college workforce training programs, the types of companies they serve, funding mechanisms, and perceived obstacles to providing effective training.

Results of the Survey

The "Survey of Community College Training Programs for Employees of Business, Industry, Labor & Government" was sent to a list of all community college chief executive officers in the United States compiled from the fifty state directories of two year colleges. The CEOs were instructed to pass the survey on to the individuals in their colleges responsible for workforce training to complete. Responses representing 763 of the 1,042 two year colleges surveyed were returned, for a remarkable response rate of 73.2 percent. Responding colleges were highly representative of all community colleges in the United States. Nearly all were public institutions; over 80 percent were comprehensive community colleges and about half were single campus colleges located in rural communities.

Extent of Training Programs. Of the 96 percent of respondents who indicated that they provide workforce training for employees of business, industry, labor, and government, almost all customized programs to meet the needs of local employers. All reported providing workforce training, although the majority did so on a modest scale. Half trained fewer than 1,000 employees during the 1991 92 academic year; half provided training for fewer than 25 employers; and half generated less than $100,000 gross in training contracts. However, 10 15 percent of the respondents reported large programs training several thousands of employees in contracts worth over a million dollars.

Types of Training and Companies Served. Two-thirds of training provided was for employees from small and medium sized companies those with fewer than 500 employees. The largest percentage was for employers in manufacturing (39.2 percent), followed by those in government and education (12.9 percent), and health services industries (11.7 percent). Most commonly provided was job specific technical training (20.2 percent), followed by computer

related training (18.6 percent), supervision and management (14.6 percent), and workplace literacy (9.8 percent). Fully 85 percent of training was delivered by traditional methodologies with few colleges employing instructional technologies. Approximately half the training was at off campus facilities provided by employers and half on campus. Most instructors were external trainers hired on a contract for services basis.

Organization and Funding. Over 90 percent of responding colleges coordinated workforce training programs under continuing education or community services. Over 85 percent reported having had training units for at least three years, the substantial majority for more than five years. Training programs were supported by contracts paid by employers (35.5 percent), college operating funds (26.9 percent), tuition and fees (16.0 percent), and state and federal sources (15.5 percent). Almost 54 percent of gross training revenues were generated by formal contracts, and 46.1 percent were repeat business. Half the contracts were one to three months in duration, and the average value of two thirds of the contracts was under $10,000.

Perceived Effectiveness and Obstacles. Nearly 85 percent of responding colleges perceived that they were effectively meeting the training needs of existing clients. Most commonly cited major obstacles to providing more effective training were inadequate training budgets (34.6 percent), the inability of employers to afford training (25.3 percent), difficulty in being recognized as training providers (22.8 percent), lack of experienced trainers (22.3 percent), and inadequate support for curriculum development and other costs (22.2 percent).

In summary, survey results show that nearly all community colleges have accepted workforce training as an extension of their longstanding career preparation, continuing education, and community service missions. However, the great majority of colleges reported operating only modest programs, citing lack of resources among both the colleges and the

companies with training needs as the most common obstacle to providing more or more effective training.

Implications for Policy and Practice

While it is not surprising to find community colleges engaged in training employees of business, industry, labor, and government, it is eye opening to find how pervasive this activity has become. Nearly all responding community colleges accept workforce training as a legitimate service for them to provide for local employers, and nearly all customize such training to meet employer needs.

Meeting Unmet Needs. Although two thirds of training provided by community colleges is for the small and medium sized businesses that make up 80 percent of all companies in the nation, surveys have documented that larger companies are much more likely to provide training for their employees. The limited amount of training provided to employees of small and medium sized companies the acknowledged engine of economic growth in the United States has been identified by some economists as the single most critical problem to be faced in improving the competitiveness of the nation's business and industry.

This being so, perhaps the most important result of this survey is to document that community colleges are already providing effective workforce training, albeit on a limited scale, in this area of most critical need for the national economy. Not only are they addressing the needs of small and medium sized companies, they also provide technical training for employees of manufacturing firms, another key need identified by the American Society for Training and Development.

Resource Constraints. A predictable survey finding was that those community colleges that provide only limited training programs cite resource constraints as the principal obstacle to

meeting local workforce training needs. Given the current fiscal crunch, it is not surprising that community colleges are unable to devote major resources to what amounts to new program initiatives. Many college training directors, in fact, report requirements to recoup both direct and indirect costs of training provided. An interesting insight is that it is not only the community colleges that are constrained by lack of resources small and medium sized businesses are also perceived as unable to afford necessary training.

These results beg the question of whether community colleges represent an intact infrastructure that could provide critically needed workforce training if able to access sufficient means to do so. It appears that an infusion of resources would be necessary to expand current efforts to the point that they match outstanding training needs. Given that constraints on public resources are likely to increase, the most realistic prospect for accessing funding is through the private sector.

Need for Private Investment. Survey results hinted that some companies either do not appreciate the value of training to their long term competitiveness, or simply balk at investment in training unless it can be shown to increase profits in the short term. It remains to be seen if college or business leaders with longer term perspectives would respond favorably to programs that might leverage public investment with private funds to provide training to improve productivity and competitiveness and, in turn, underwrite training costs. The case needs to be made that economic returns justify increased investment in training.

Perhaps the most important result of the survey is to establish that community colleges represent an existing base resource with the capability and, it appears, the inclination to provide the workforce training most needed by the nation's economy. They already concentrate most of their efforts on small and medium sized companies in technical areas precisely the type of

training that is currently the most neglected, and yet is, at the same time, the most needed to enhance the competitiveness of the nation's economy.

However, community colleges will not be able to fulfill their potential to meet training needs without the investment of more resources. This investment will not be made until business and industry leaders accept training as a cost of doing business, an investment that will be returned directly to the bottom line. This investment will not be made until state and federal officials recognize the potential for community colleges to deliver effective training and develop policies and funding mechanisms that encourage the utilization of this in place infrastructure. This investment will not be made until community college faculty, staff, boards of trustees, and CEOs step up to the training mission as fundamental to their commitment to meet local needs and to serve the vital economic and educational interests of the nation.

Brenda Marshall Beckman is associate director of the League for Innovation in the Community College and coordinates projects related to business and industry training for the League, including its Community College Business and Industry Alliance and the Business and Industry Services Network. Don Doucette is also associate director of the League and is the principal investigator for the survey on which this abstract is based. A complete report of the survey results is available from the League office, (714) 367 2884.

Leadership Abstracts March 1993 Volume 6, Number 3

League for Innovation in the Community College

POSITIONING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

Edgar J. Boone and George B. Vaughan

Community college leaders face challenges today that extend well beyond the boundaries of traditional degree programs and on□campus instruction. While venturing beyond these boundaries is nothing new to them, the challenges they face are different in degree, if not always in kind, from past challenges.

In the past two decades, community colleges have reached out to their communities and assisted with economic development activities, worked to improve secondary schools, and provided industry□specific job training for local employers. However, the pressing needs of the communities in which they are located mean that community colleges can no longer afford to wait for constituents to request assistance. Instead of simply reacting to expressed needs, community colleges must work with community organizations and leaders at all levels to identify and address critical community concerns. They must become community□based colleges, and college leaders must work to ensure that their institutions play appropriate roles in helping to solve community problems□sometimes as catalyst, sometimes as leader, convener, or participant. To be effective, in today's environment, college leaders must collaborate with other leaders in the community in applying a rational, orderly process to help resolve community issues.

Repositioning the Community College

Community college leaders that seek to assist the resolution of community issues must be prepared to reposition their institutions to serve as catalysts, leaders, or in other roles as needed. How to effect such repositioning is an important question currently being worked on by the Academy for Community College Leadership Advancement, Innovation, and Modeling (ACCLAIM) at North Carolina State University. Funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the ACCLAIM project is currently working with the state systems of community colleges in Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia to develop and implement a process that positions the community college to play a major role in resolving community issues and revitalizing the lives of individuals and the communities in which they live.

The process is community□based programming, an approach to planning that provides the model for much of the work of ACCLAIM. The importance of the model is that it provides a philosophical base, a framework, and a process by which community college leaders can reposition their colleges to work with community leaders, organizations, and agencies to solve problems that threaten the health and welfare of their communities, and ultimately the nation.

The ACCLAIM Model

The ACCLAIM model is based upon the assumption that community colleges are community□based institutions devoted to improving the quality of life of the citizens and communities they serve. Further, the model assumes that there now exists a critical need for community colleges to become the moving force in promoting greater collaboration among community□based organizations, formal and informal leaders, and citizens in seeking resolution to major and complex issues.

The model, which can be adapted successfully by most community colleges, consists of a series of processual tasks. While the tasks follow a logical order, the model is flexible enough to allow an institution that has already worked through some of the steps to adapt the model to meet its needs. A key feature of the model, other than its adaptability and flexibility, is that it assumes that community colleges never work alone in resolving community issues, thus avoiding a mistake too many colleges have made in the past. The model, then, defines a process by which a community college can work effectively in collaboration with other agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals to carry out its mission as a community□based institution.

The Processual Tasks

The ACCLAIM model requires the commitment of institutional leaders to community□based programming and acceptance of the role of the college in addressing problems outside its walls. The following tasks outline a process for its effective involvement in the community.

1. The community college must critically examine its mission, philosophy, goals, and organizational structure to determine if it is prepared, both philosophically and practically, to assume the role of a community□based institution. The goal of the examination is to position or reposition, if need be□the institution so that a major emphasis is placed on community□based programming as the process through which the community□based mission is fulfilled. One objective of the examination is to develop a definition of community□based programming that is in concert with the institutional mission and philosophy.

2. The community college must increase its knowledge of the social, cultural, economic, and political environments of its service area. An understanding of the dynamics of the community and it linkages to the larger environment is key to successful community based programming.

3. The community college must establish a mechanism for scanning its external environment. In most cases, the logical way of doing this is to establish an environmental scanning committee made up of representatives of the community and the college. Scanning the environment will aid institutional leaders in identifying and ranking emerging issues that are of critical concern to the community and its citizens. The college president should incorporate the environmental scanning process into the college's permanent administrative and governance structures, and the environmental scanning committee should report to the president and assist in the planning process as needed.

4. The issues identified by the environmental scanning process should be ranked and confirmed as important by both formal and informal community leaders who are not members of the scanning committee but who have a vested interest in seeing issues resolved. These leaders who assist in reviewing issues are one of several constituent groups and participants in the process that should be regularly kept apprised of the progress being made in resolving identified issues.

5. The community college should analyze, identify, and map the publics within its service region who are directly affected by each issue identified by the environmental scan. The goal is to identify those groups and individual leaders who will play key roles in resolving an issue, as well as those who have any vested interests in their resolution. Another goal is to identify those leaders who reflect the beliefs and values of the target public and who wield influence with those publics.

6. The community college, in its role as catalyst, can initiate dialogue among community leaders and others involved in a given issue. The objective is to create understanding of the issue among the members of the target public and its leaders and to interest them in seeking a resolution to the issue. Once an understanding of the issue is achieved, a coalition is formed consisting of

representatives from the college, the target public, and other stakeholders affected by the issue. The community college can provide the setting for the coalition to discuss the issue and to develop a plan for its resolution. The purpose of the coalition is to reach a consensus on a plan for resolving the issue. However, once an issue is resolved, the coalition is dissolved.

7. The community college provides leadership for the coalition in developing, coordinating, carrying out, and evaluating the plan for addressing the community problem. At this stage, members of the coalition must commit resources to resolving the issue. In addition to determining how resources will be obtained and utilized, the plan provides a mechanism for coalition leaders and others to report on the progress being made in carrying out the plan and for modifying it as needed. In evaluating the plan, care must be given to establishing goals, reviewing them regularly, determining if they have been met, and revising them as required.

8. The plan requires that the coalition leaders report to their respective constituencies on the progress of the plan and the result achieved to date. It is especially important to keep members of the target public, its leaders, other stakeholders, members of the college community, and all those who have been involved in the process of the progress being made in resolving the issue of concern.

9. Those elements of the plan to which the college has committed resources must be incorporated into its institutional planning and budgeting processes. The college board and president must continue to prioritize the college's involvement in plans to resolve various community issues. They must anticipate their involvement in other emerging issues and balance the college's continued commitment of resources to the current issue with its other and future commitments.

College leaders then evaluate what they have learned from working to resolve the current issue and apply it to any emerging issues. If a new issue emerges, the process begins anew, utilizing those aspects of the community based programming model that are required.

The ACCLAIM **model for community□based** programming provides community college leaders with both the philosophical base and a rational process for positioning their institutions for leadership in their communities□a role which effective community colleges must occupy if they are to fulfill their missions as community□based institutions. The model also provides practical advice on how community colleges can assist in identifying and resolving important community problems. While a community focus is not new to community colleges, they have never been more **relevant to helping the nation and its communities address the major challenges facing them.** Community college **leaders must step up to the task to lead both their** colleges and their communities.

Edgar J. Boone is professor and director of the ACCLAIM project at North Carolina State University. George B. Vaughan is professor and associate director of the ACCLAIM project. Much of the foregoing discussion was abstracted from Community□Based Programming: An Opportunity and Imperative for the Community College by Edgar J. Boone, published by North Carolina State University in December 1992.

The authors and other ACCLAIM staff will conduct a preconference workshop on community□based programming at "Leadership 2000, "July 18□21, 1993, in Washington, D. C. Contact the League office, (714) 367□2884, for registration information.

Leadership Abstracts April 1993 Volume 6, Number 4

League for Innovation in the Community College

PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE FOR ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING

developed under the auspices of the AAHE Assessment Forum

American colleges have a long history of grading and certifying student work. The more recent practice of assessment builds on that history by looking at student achievement not only within courses but across them, asking about cumulative learning outcomes. As a systematic process of gathering, interpreting, and using information about student learning, assessment is a powerful tool for educational improvement.

Today, hundreds of colleges and universities are doing assessment, at the classroom, program, and institutional levels. The practice has become a universal expectation for accreditation and a frequent object of state mandate; nine out of ten institutions now report that they have some type of assessment activity under way. Along the way, a "wisdom of practice" has emerged; the nine principles that follow constitute an attempt to capture some of that practical wisdom.

Guidelines for Assessment

1. The assessment of student learning begins with educational values. Assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice, then, begins with and enacts a vision of the kinds of learning we most value for students and strive to help them achieve. Educational values should drive not only *what* we choose to assess but also *how* we do so. Where questions about educational mission and values are skipped over, assessment threatens

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to be an exercise in measuring what is easy, rather than a process of improving what we really care about.

2. Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time. Learning is a complex process. It entails not only what students know but what they can do with what they know; it involves not only knowledge and abilities but values, attitudes, and habits of mind that affect both academic success and performance beyond the classroom. Assessment should reflect these understandings by employing a diverse array of methods, including those that call for actual performance, using them over time so as to reveal change, growth, and increasing degrees of integration.

Such an approach aims for a more complete and accurate picture of learning, and therefore firmer basis for improving students' educational experience.

3. Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve□have clear, explicitly stated purposes. Assessment is a goal□oriented process. It entails comparing educational performance with educational purposes and expectations□these derived from the institution's mission, from faculty intentions in program and course design, and from knowledge of students' own goals. Where program purposes lack specificity or agreement, assessment as a process pushes a campus toward clarity about where to aim and what standards to apply; assessment also prompts attention to where and how program goals will be taught and learned. Clear, shared, implemental goals are the cornerstone for assessment that is focused and useful.

4. Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes. Information about outcomes is of high importance; where students end up matters greatly. But to improve outcomes, we need to know about student experience along the

way□about the curricula, teaching, and kind of student effort that lead to particular outcomes. Assessment can help us understand which students learn best under what conditions; with such knowledge comes the capacity to improve the whole of their learning.

5. Assessment works best when it is ongoing, not episodic. Assessment is a process whose power is cumulative. Though isolated, one□shot assessment can be better than none, improvement is best fostered when assessment entails a linked series of activities undertaken over time. This may mean tracking the progress of individual students, or of cohorts of students; it may mean collecting the same examples of student performance or using the same instrument semester after semester. The point is to monitor progress toward intended goals in a spirit of continuous improvement. Along the way, the assessment process itself should be evaluated and refined in light of emerging insights.

6. Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community ***are involved.*** Student learning is a campuswide responsibility, and assessment is a way of enacting that responsibility. Thus, while assessment efforts may start small, the aim over time is to involve people from across the educational community. Faculty play an especially important role, but questions of assessment cannot be fully addressed without participation by student affairs educators, librarians, administrators, and students. Assessment may also involve individuals from beyond the campus (alumni/ae, trustees, employers) whose experience can enrich the sense of appropriate aims and standards for learning. Thus understood, assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim is wider, better□informed attention to student learning by all parties with a stake in its improvement.

7. Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really are about. Assessment recognizes the value of information in the process of

improvement. But to be useful, information must be connected to issues or questions that people really care about. This implies assessment approaches that produce evidence that relevant parties will find credible, suggestive, and applicable to decisions that need to be made. It means thinking in advance about how the information will be used, and by whom. The point of assessment is not to gather data and return results; it is a process that starts with the questions of decision makers, that involves them in the gathering and interpreting of data, and that informs and helps guide continuous improvement.

8. Assessment is most likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change. Assessment alone changes little. Its greatest contribution comes on campuses where the quality of teaching and learning is visibly valued and worked at. On such campuses, the push to improve educational performance is a visible and primary goal of leadership; improving the quality of undergraduate education is central to the institution's planning, budgeting, and personnel decisions. On such campuses, information about learning outcomes is seen as an integral part of decision making, and avidly sought.

9. Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public. There is a compelling public stake in education. As educators, we have a responsibility to the publics that support or depend on us to provide information about the ways in which our students meet goals and expectations. But that responsibility goes beyond the reporting of such information; our deeper obligation□to ourselves, our students, and society□is to improve. Those to whom educators are accountable have a corresponding obligation to support such attempts at improvement.

A Vision of Education

It is hoped that campuses will find these principles helpful for examining current practice and for developing and discussing their own principles. Further, the authors hope that the principles here will support campus assessment leaders in their work with the administrators, policymakers, and legislators who often set the conditions that determine whether assessment will lead to real improvement. This second purpose seems especially important given the current national debate about educational standards, testing, and accountability. The links between assessment and improved student learning must not be lost in this debate.

The core value behind this document is the importance of improving education that entails high expectations for all students, active forms of learning, coherent curricula, and effective out□of□class opportunities. To these ends, we in the higher education community need assessment□systematic, usable information about student learning□that helps us fulfill our responsibilities to the students who come to us for an education and to the publics whose trust supports our work.

The authors of this statement are twelve practitioner-students of assessment as it has developed on campuses and to some extent at the K□12 level: ***Alexander W. Astin,*** *University of California at Los Angeles;* ***Trudy W. Banta,*** *Indiana University□Purdue University at Indianapolis;* ***K. Patricia Cross,*** *University of California, Berkeley;* ***Elaine El□Khawas,*** *American Council on Education;* ***Peter T. Ewell,*** *National Center for Higher Education Management Systems;* ***Pat Hutchings,*** *American Association for Higher Education;* ***Theodore J. Marchese,*** *American Association for Higher Education;* ***Kay M. McClenney,*** *Education Commission of the States;* ***Marcia Mentkowski,*** *Alverno College;* ***Margaret A. Miller,*** *State Council of Higher Education*

for Virginia; ***E. Thomas Moran,*** *State University of New York, Plattsburgh;* ***Barbara D. Wright,*** *University of Connecticut.*

This abstract reprints in large part a document developed with the sponsorship of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). Publication and dissemination of the original document was supported by the Exxon Education Foundation. Copies of the document are available in packets of 25 at no charge while supplies last from Assessment Principles of Good Practice, AAHE, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036□1110; telephone (202) 293□6440, fax (202) 293□0073.

Leadership Abstracts May 1993 Volume 6, Number 5

League for Innovation in the Community College

CATALYST FOR COMMUNITY CHANGE: HELPING TO ADDRESS CRITICAL ISSUES

Nancy LeCroy and Barbara Tedrow

From its inception, the community college has fashioned its mission through a symbiotic relationship with the local community that has been fundamentally influenced by proximity and need. In its brief history, these colleges have solidified first transfer, then occupational, and finally community service and support roles through a give and take with local constituencies. However, as the issues with which individuals and communities struggle on a daily basis have become more urgent, the tensions inherent in the relationship between college and community have become more apparent.

Communities struggle with drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, the breakdown of the family unit, environmental depletion and risk, deteriorating infrastructures, and crippling realities associated with economic stagnation unemployment, underemployment, and declining living standards; increasing crime, violence, and homelessness; overburdened health care, social service, and education systems; and volatile tensions associated with race, culture, and class that have stretched the fabric of communal life to dangerous limits.

Adding to the urgency is the general sense that the nation's political institutions have failed to address the problems that trouble people most. Too often, public debate is adversarial and unproductive. Too often, there is little agreement about what to do to make things better. Too often, even when decisions are made, solutions are ineffective because they lack sufficient public support.

Tension in Mission

Given this reality, it should not be surprising that some community colleges are seeking to respond to critical community needs, despite a chorus of criticism that argues that their mission is already dangerously overextended, that they should stick to their knitting and concentrate on improving educational performance. Community colleges have been criticized not for the failure to broaden the mission, but for the failure to perform established roles effectively. Thus, the most important task is to ensure strong transfer, technical education, and support for primary academic missions.

On the other side is an equally fervent group warning that a strictly academic posture is too static and unrealistic given the pressures facing their students and communities. Both by its placement and its history, the community college movement has created an expectation virtually a psychological contract that it will help communities meet their most pressing needs, needs that cannot be satisfactorily addressed through regular academic programs. To fail to keep this underlying promise now, when the urgency is so obvious, is an abdication. The tension is between continuing education and community development; between academic expectations and constituent needs; between traditional disciplines and instructional methodologies and process related skills and community based learning strategies.

Guidelines for Conducting Community Forums

Although the debate is far from settled, a number of major foundations have embarked upon program initiatives to find new educational mechanisms to help communities draw upon their own resource to address their own problems. Under the rubric of community "capacity building," they have funded a variety of projects, including a two year effort by the League for

Innovation to explore the role and potential impact of community colleges in helping to solve urgent community problems.

Developing Guidelines. In 1991, The Hitachi Foundation funded the League to develop and pilot test a process that can be replicated by community colleges nationwide to build the capacity of local citizens to address critical community issues. One of the intended outcomes of the project is guidelines describing how to plan and conduct community forums on such issues. Included in the guidelines are planning tips and suggestions for supporting follow up activities to ensure that the forums have lasting impact on local communities.

Building Community Capacity. The second major result of the project is building the capacity of the nine colleges and communities that participate in the pilot project to deal with real problems. Each forum is the first step in identifying community leaders who can assist in solving local problems, in creating liaisons among community groups to work toward common solutions, and in establishing a process for local issue resolution. Each college will engage in follow up activities to ensure that tangible benefits result from the project, and that some problem solving capacity is added to the community.

Conducting Forums. To achieve the purpose of the project, the League sponsored nine community forums by community colleges across the nation on a variety of critical local issues. The experiences of these colleges were used to field test a process and draft guidelines to be used by community colleges and citizen leaders in planning, designing, organizing, managing, and following up on community forums on critical issues.

Delta College Community Forum

One college illustrates how the community forums were conducted as part of the funded project.

The Issue. The major issue facing the Tri Cities area in Michigan (Saginaw, Bay City, and Midland) is unemployment. General Motors, the primary local employer, faced an economic downturn in the 1980s when auto sales slumped as a result of increasing competition from foreign markets. Much confusion and blame followed, which seriously hampered any coordinated strategy to counter the economic downturn.

The Forum. On Thursday, November 5,1992, at the International Centre in downtown Saginaw, Michigan, more than 400 area residents attended, "Now that You've Lost Your job, How Are You Going to Get One Back?" The event, directed by the college's Global/International Education Office, included a career information fair supported by the college's Career Planning and Placement Office. Cosponsors were the Michigan Employment Security Commission (MESQ, the League of Women Voters, and Saginaw Valley State University. The participants included those underemployed, unemployed, or seeking a career change from the three counties that make up the college's service area.

The goals of the forum were the following: 1) to create an awareness about the issues surrounding the current economic downturn, 2) to identify strategies to promote the community's economic development, 3) to identify strategies and skills needed to help individuals find jobs in the current market, 4) to offer opportunities for networking with local employers, and 5) to provide feedback to all cosponsors and participants.

After six months of planning, the daylong event unfolded in four phases. First, a keynote was presented by Walter Adams, a noted economist from Michigan State University. He summarized the reasons for the economic downturn in this country, describing the deregulation of business, which led to big business mergers rather than the research and development that

tends to provide job growth. Adams used the automobile industry, specifically General Motors, as an example of "bigness" that did not work.

The second phase of the program began with panel presentations by local business and industrial leaders, each of whom had seven minutes to respond to Adams' remarks. The panelists represented a regional economic planning office, a small business, the Michigan Employment Security Commission, General Motors, a training agency, and a chamber of commerce. Work attitudes and skills were stressed as major factors in job security by the panelists whose comments were followed by questions.

The third phrase was a brainstorming session which addressed two questions: what can the community do to deal with the economic downturn and what can individuals do to help themselves deal with this reality? Forty small groups developed and shared ideas in a process that took ninety minutes. The event ended with a career information fair in an adjoining conference room. Over 50 local businesses were exhibitors, and 200 forum participants attended the fair.

Evaluation and Follow Up. The forum was a success and a large cross section of the community attended. The brainstorming session generated ideas for assisting both individuals and the community. The level of community support and the quality of collaboration among sponsoring groups developed the groundwork for future projects. An example of follow up forum activities included a joint communication from the forum sponsors to the participants summarizing the suggestions generated through the brainstorming session.

Insights from Experience

The nine participating colleges shared the insights that they had developed in conducting community forums, including a list of common problems: the difficulty of focusing the topic; the

special effort required to build the necessary support in both the community and the college; the tendency to underestimate the amount of work involved in hosting the event; the difficulty in reaching closure, sometimes creating the feeling that nothing was accomplished by the forum; and the corollary difficulty of designing appropriate follow up action.

In spite of these concerns, these colleges, without exception, reported that their forums helped their local communities confront wide ranging and sometimes controversial topics, increase their understanding of these issues, and create at least the beginnings of a framework for problem solving. Equally important, it is clear that host colleges were perceived to be appropriate conveners and catalysts for such community building undertakings. They were able to bring the necessary players to the table and create a safe environment in which the risky business of conferral could begin. This success bodes well for the future of community forums and suggests that the convening function can become an important strategy in community development.

Nancy LeCroy is assistant to the chancellor of the Dallas County Community College District and consultant to the League's Hitachi Project. Barbara Tedrow is director of Global/International Education at Delta College, University Center, Michigan, and forum coordinator at the college.

The document that resulted from this project, Catalyst for Community Change: Guidelines for Community Colleges to Conduct Community Forums, will be distributed free to all registrants at "Leadership 2000," sponsored by the League for Innovation and The University of Texas at Austin, July 18 21, 1993, in Washington, D. C. For registration information or copies for sale, contact the League office, (714) 367 2884.

Leadership Abstracts June 1993 Volume 6, Number 6

League for Innovation in the Community College

PART TIME FACULTY: PARTNERS IN EXCELLENCE

John McGuire

The use of part time faculty in community colleges is generally considered a necessary evil, rationalized as an important strategy for saving money and maintaining flexibility. Some have decried the overuse of part timers as a cheap fix, a dangerous addiction, or exploitation of the worse kind. However, part time faculty are a problem only if they are relegated to the margins of the institution and treated with the respect usually reserved for skeletons in the collective community college closet.

In fact, a good case can be made that part time faculty bring important benefits to community colleges. If care is taken to provide for their professional development and integration into the mainstream of the institution, part time faculty can be key assets in the delivery of quality, up to date instructional programs.

The Alleged Problem

Over the last two decades community colleges have developed an increasingly greater reliance on the use of part time faculty. Comprising 41 percent of all faculty in 1973, part time faculty had grown to 60 percent by 1986. The percentage appears to have stabilized around 60 percent of the total number of faculty employed, though they generally account for a considerably smaller percentage of the total number of credit hours taught. Still, it is not uncommon for urban community colleges to have levels of 70 percent to 80 percent part time faculty.

Dire Warnings. Many have decried this over reliance on part time faculty as a serious problem. The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges reported: "The increasing numbers of part time faculty at many colleges are a disturbing trend. We urge that the unrestrained expansion of part time faculty be avoided." The National Education Association described part timers as a "corps of unregulated personnel" that can be exploited "by unscrupulous administrators and boards."

Others have established formulae to limit the use of part time faculty. A report by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recommended that no more than 25 percent of the faculty be made up of part-timers. The Futures' Commission recommended, "a majority of credits awarded by a community college should be earned in classes taught by full time faculty." A 1989 composition conference recommended that the number of part time writing teachers "be kept to a minimum," and "When more than 10 percent of a department's sections are taught by part time faculty, the department should reconsider its hiring procedures." In 1988, California went so far as to legislate staffing ratios of 70 percent full time to 30 percent part time faculty.

No Evidence of Ineffectiveness. However, there is a conspicuous lack of evidence that part time faculty are ineffective teachers to warrant either hand wringing or legislation. In fact, most studies comparing full time and part time faculty report little or no difference in teaching effectiveness. A 1980 study by L. H. Willett found no significant differences between the two groups on student ratings of teaching, class retention, or student achievement in subsequent classes as measured by grades. A 1986 Miami Dade Community College study involving 1,075 students in 38 sections of English 101 found no significant differences between students of part

time and full time faculty in grades in the next English course or scores on a competency based exit exam.

Redefining the Problem. More likely, the biggest problem appears to be institutional neglect of part time faculty, who are routinely treated as second class citizens the "neglected majority." In large part, part time faculty have been excluded from the collegium. They are not so much a neglected majority, as an excluded majority. They are not invited to faculty division meetings, are not included in faculty development activities, do not participate in textbook selection, do not advise students, and do not participate in developing or approving curricula. The most common solution proposed to address the alleged problem of part time faculty is to limit, reduce, or eliminate their use. A better solution is to include and involve them in the collegium. If part time faculty are qualified to step into the classroom, they are also qualified to assume other faculty responsibilities.

Benefits of Part Time Faculty

The extensive use of part time faculty may not be only a necessary evil. Such use may also reflect enlightened leadership. Under proper circumstances, part time faculty can strengthen and benefit a college and its curriculum in a number of ways.

Good Teachers. Part time faculty are good teachers. They receive the same student ratings and achieve the same student outcomes as full time community college faculty who are nearly universally acknowledged to be the best teachers in higher education.

Curriculum Resource. Part time faculty bring breadth, depth, and relevance to the curriculum and allow colleges to teach subjects that would otherwise be excluded from the curriculum. The variety of their skills and experiences allow instruction in exotic foreign languages and specialty occupational areas, which would be difficult to offer with only full time

faculty. Many are practitioners of their profession, and they bring state of the art practices into the classroom that help bridge the gap between the classroom and the workplace.

Commitment. Part time faculty generally are highly motivated to teach. One study found that intrinsic rewards and contributions to human development were the most important motivators for them. Given low rates of pay, it is clear that most are not teaching for the money.

Link to Community. Part time faculty provide a strong link to the community. Each is an ambassador for the college to its community, and many are community leaders themselves. They can assist a college to build networks and linkages with its larger community.

Link to the Workplace. Part time faculty often provide an effective link to area employers and job markets. They help ensure that curricula remain up to date and matched to industry practice. They can help place students in jobs after program completion or for part time experience while enrolled. Also, links to employers can open up opportunities for the college to provide customized training programs, which are usually revenue producers for the college.

Talent Pool. Part time faculty provide a tried, tested, and talented pool for full time faculty recruits. In 1989, Austin Community College reported that 69 percent of its newly hired full time faculty came from its part time faculty. That same year, Foothill De Anza Community College District reported that 64 percent of its new hires came from its part time faculty ranks.

Economy. Part time faculty do save money, between one third and one half of the cost of using fulltime faculty. In a very real sense, they help subsidize programs and full time faculty salaries; however, this is the most dubious benefit. If savings remain the driving motive for using part time faculty, colleges will treat them as second class citizens and will be reluctant to provide the resources necessary to support their teaching and integration into the institution. Part time

faculty are only a problem when they are viewed as a source of cheap labor. When employed responsibly, they become treasured resources for the instructional program.

Development and Integration of Part Time Faculty

Too often, colleges fail to integrate part time faculty into their institutions. A 1982 study found that only 31 percent of community colleges provide a formal orientation for their part time faculty. More needs to be done.

Development. Effective professional development for part time faculty should include the following types of activities. A 6 8 hour workshop should be required of all new part time faculty before the semester begins. Topics should include the mission and philosophy of the community college, methodologies for teaching adults, the essentials of effective teaching, course preplanning and syllabus preparation, and tips for the first class session. It is important to pay part time faculty for attending such workshops and scheduled activities.

A mentor program can be an effective development strategy. Veteran faculty, including veteran part time faculty, serve as mentors by visiting classes, assisting with course and material preparation, and acting as resources on effective teaching strategies. New faculty and mentors jointly set performance goals and evaluate progress toward them. Peer classroom observation by trained observers with immediate feedback to the instructor and a written report to the division chair can also be used effectively as long as such evaluation is strictly formative in nature. Student evaluation can aid professional development for part time faculty.

A complete development effort will include workshops and seminars on topics such as testing and grading, collaborative learning, learning and teaching styles, and use of instructional technology. These activities help part time faculty to become better, perhaps outstanding,

teachers. They send a message to part time faculty that effective teaching is important at the college and that the college is prepared to help them become better teachers.

Integration. Part time faculty should also be provided opportunities to contribute to the instructional program, and they should be recognized and paid for their contributions. They can be effective in student advising, textbook selection, curriculum development, grant writing, and committee service. They should be provided office space and clerical support, invited to all department meetings scheduled at times when they can attend, and encouraged to attend college social functions.

Institutions need to develop sensitivity to part time faculty and to be alert to unintended messages contained in college policies, publications, or administrative behavior that convey to part time faculty that they are marginal members of the collegium. It is critical to remember them at contract time, and to raise their salaries proportionately when full time salaries are raised.

Employment of part time faculty is not going to diminish over the next decade. Colleges are overdue to begin viewing part time faculty as important resources and full and equal members of the collegium and to begin treating them accordingly. Rather than struggling to define appropriate limits on the number of part time faculty, colleges must work to provide them with professional development activities and to integrate them into the institution. The use of part time faculty is not an addiction to be cured. Instead, colleges need to kick their habit of discouraging part time faculty from being the partners in excellence they have the potential to become.

John McGuire is president of Owensboro Community College, University of Kentucky System, and a graduate of the League for Innovation's Executive Leadership Institute. He previously

served as dean of instruction at the Community College of Aurora, Colorado. For citations to the studies referred to in this abstract, call (502) 686 4403.

Leadership Abstracts July 1993 Volume 6, Number 7

League for Innovation in the Community College

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TWO□WAY TEACHING AND LEARNING

Nancy E. Stetson

Too often, community college students fail to learn what instructors are teaching because instructors routinely use a teaching process that only works about 17 percent of the time. K. Patricia Cross points out that "teachers in the□average classroom spend about 80 percent of their time lecturing to students, who are attending to what is being said only about half the time." According to J. McLeisch, it gets worse: After the lecture, students carry away in their heads and in their notebooks not more than 42 percent of the content. And, says Cross, it gets even worse: A week later students can recall only 17 percent of the lecture material.

These findings beg the question: If lecturing, the dominant form of instruction in community colleges, works only 17 percent of the time, why do community college instructors use it so extensively? Several plausible explanations have been advanced, but nearly all harken back to traditional practices and models of instruction that are centuries old. Perhaps an equally important question is what can community college leaders do to assist faculty in moving from one□way teaching methods to two□way teaching and learning processes both to improve student learning and to ensure the effectiveness of the institution's educational mission in an era of increasing accountability?

One□Way and Two□Way Processes

Community college presidents can help students learn by supporting faculty development programs that help faculty to understand the limitations of traditional one□way instructional processes and to learn two□way teaching and learning processes.

The reasons one□way processes do not work are clear. The instructor sends the lesson to the students, and students either receive the lesson or they do not. If they do not, the instructor may not know it until it is too late to help, perhaps in the middle or end of the term. Except for psychomotor learning, the instructor cannot immediately see which students learned the lesson and which did not. Cognitive and affective learning are internal, usually invisible processes. Using two□way processes, the instructor facilitates the learning experience for the students by means of a variety of cooperative and active learning methods. Once again, students either learn the lesson or they do not. However, using a variety of strategies for receiving feedback from students collectively called Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs), teachers know when students are not learning what is intended to be taught because students regularly give them visible (often written), immediate, and anonymous feedback.

Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs)

In 1988, K. Patricia Cross and Thomas A. Angelo developed a handbook on classroom assessment techniques designed to help faculty find out if students were learning what they were teaching. Many of the 30 original techniques, expanded to 50 in the recently published second edition, are being used by college faculty throughout the nation to get visible, immediate, and anonymous feedback from their students. The use of these techniques is one way to help make teaching and learning a two□way process.

An example of a frequently used technique is the One□Minute Paper. It provides a quick and simple way to collect written feedback on student learning. To use the One□Minute Paper, the instructor stops class a few minutes early and asks students to respond briefly to some variation on the following two questions: "What was the most important thing you learned today?" and "What important question remains unanswered?" Students write their responses on index cards or half sheets of paper and hand them in. The instructor uses the responses to find patterns of important things students have not yet learned about the topic so that he can reteach these things at the beginning of the next class. This technique can be used in small or large classes and, if an instructor insists on lecturing, even in a lecture class.

College of Marin's CAT Program

Angelo pilot tested the use of the techniques, a component of the Cross and Angelo Classroom Research model, at several community colleges beginning in fall 1988. College of Marin in Kentfield, California, was one of those community colleges. Now, five years later, thousands of College of Marin students are giving feedback to their instructors every semester on what they are learning or not learning, helping to make teaching and learning a two□way process.

From fall 1988 to spring 1992, 70 College of Marin faculty participated in a four□year on□site Classroom Assessment Training program, partially funded by the Marin Community Foundation. Fifty-eight of those 70 faculty were surveyed in spring 1993; twenty, or 35 percent, responded to the survey. Although the number of faculty represented by the survey results was modest, their comments provide a useful basis for judging the impact of the CATs training program.

Impact on Teaching. One to four years after receiving their last semester of training, 85 percent of the faculty responding to the survey were still using CATs. Sixty percent were using them three or more times a semester. Eighty□five percent of the faculty believed their use of CATS had a positive impact on their teaching. Twenty□five percent specifically mentioned feedback: "More direct feedback; keeps my plans focused." One faculty member had integrated CATs into her classes so completely that she found it difficult to tell when she was not using one. She said, "It seems strange, now, to teach without frequent feedback." Others commented on how using CATS had changed some of their approaches to instruction: "After receiving feedback, I focus the subsequent assignments on their perceived needs." "I prepare my lecture after receiving the feedback from students to cover the material they are having difficulty learning."

Impact on Learning. Two□thirds of the faculty believed their use of CATS had a positive impact on student learning. One faculty member wryly commented that she did not know if her comprehensive use of CATS had a positive impact on learning because "sometimes the students seemed to get it better before I started checking what they really knew." Another said, "Students always become more verbal, articulate in their needs when asked to participate in class; more confident, willing to express themselves. Students learn better in classes if they participate; are asked to participate via their feedback." "They receive feedback about fellow students' needs and understandings."

Five□Year Results. Fifty percent of the faculty said they had evidence that their use of CATS had a positive impact on teaching or learning, or both. Half mentioned grades; the other half mentioned other indicators such as student performance on final examinations, increased

class participation, improved quality of term projects and portfolios, and increased rates of progress.

Some of the best evidence was the satisfaction that instructors took in what they perceived to be the improved performance of their students as a result of their using Classroom Assessment Techniques. "As an instructor every quarter for nine years at the College of Marin, I know students gain more, learn more, are more satisfied when they participate and express themselves in classes. Classes are fuller, livelier, brighter." Another said, "I learn things I could not have guessed or anticipated (and I thought I knew my Students)."

Recommendations for a Successful Program

The following recommendations are based on five years experience in providing training in the use of Classroom Assessment Techniques for faculty at the College of Marin and dozens of community colleges throughout the nation:

1. Plan carefully **and plan for the long term.** Unlearning old one□way behavior and learning new two□way behavior takes time.

2. Offer systematic and substantive training over a period of at least one semester. One□day workshops usually will not result in changed behavior.

3. In designing the training, use what is already known about good teaching and learning. Proven principles include frequent trainer contact with the faculty; prompt feedback from the trainer to faculty; use of cooperative and active learning strategies; encouragement of faculty to use CATs frequently; use of a variety of teaching methods, including small groups and CAT training videos□three of which have been coproduced by the College of Marin and the University of California, Berkeley; clear expectations about what the faculty are to learn, such as written

course outlines, homework, and learning contracts; and the use of an enthusiastic and expert trainer.

4. Provide ongoing support for individuals and groups, for example, one□on□one consultations with the staff development officer, monthly meetings of participants, and "study buddies."

5. Use faculty participants as recruiters for the program. They can make presentations to groups during staff development days, or recruit one on one.

6. Offer incentives, both tangible and intangible, to those who participate fully, including stipends, food, pleasant workshop environment, opportunities for presentations, encouragement for publications, and other support.

7. Last, but not least, make faculty participation in the program voluntary and nonthreatening.

Community college presidents can help students succeed by supporting faculty development programs in Classroom Assessment Training and other programs that have proven themselves successful in positively changing faculty behavior. These programs include Great Teachers Seminars, Instructional Skills Workshops, Learning Styles Training, and Student□Centered Instructional Practices. Strong faculty development programs can help faculty learn how to open up the one□way process of teaching and turn it into the two□way process of teaching and learning, and thus improve student learning. Such programs can also help colleges apply innovative instructional methodologies to meet the changing needs of students in a fast□changing world.

Nancy E. Stetson is an instructor of business, management, communications, and journalism at College of Marin and a graduate of the League for Innovation's Executive Leadership Institute. She previously served as vice president for planning and development at College of Marin before

re□entering the classroom in 1991. She is president of Company of Experts, a group of community college educators who help colleges meet their staff and organization development needs. For further information, call her at (415) 456□8639.

Leadership Abstracts August 1993 Volume 6, Number 8

League for Innovation in the Community College

A COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT'S GUIDE TO CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS

Herrington J. Bryce

Faced with declining support from traditional sources of revenue, community colleges, as well as public institutions of all kinds, have been called upon to do more with less. As state appropriations have declined in real dollars, many colleges have initiated a broad range of efficiency measures, and a few have even experimented with strategies for increasing productivity not only in administrative operations, but also in the delivery of instruction. Yet, despite some success in achieving new efficiencies, it is clear that community colleges cannot balance their budgets while increasing the services they provide to constituents by cost cutting alone. Colleges need also to address the revenue side of the equation. In particular, they need to seek additional revenues from nontraditional sources.

Colleges have already discovered that user fees, that is, tuition, laboratory fees, and so forth, can only be raised so high before such increases begin to threaten access, a bedrock value of most community colleges. Others have found that foundations and government agencies which have previously been the source of grant funds have targeted their efforts on priorities other than higher education or decreased the amount of funding available. Traditional development efforts focusing on alumni have been hurt by lean economic times. As a result, corporations have emerged as a significant source of potential revenue, yet most community colleges have little experience in raising funds from corporate giving.

Understanding Corporations

The task of securing gifts from corporations usually falls to the college president, supported by well selected staff. To be successful, however, presidents and other development officers need to come to understand the psyche of those in corporations who control discretionary giving. Perhaps the greatest obstacles in seeking funds from corporations are the misunderstandings that many community college leaders have about corporate giving. The following cautions can help inform a successful effort in raising funds from corporations.

Priorities. It is important to remember that corporations, no matter how benevolent, do not see any particular college as a high priority. Each dollar that goes to a college is one less to shareholders in the form of dividends, to executives and employees in the form of compensation, retained by the corporations for reinvestment, or to pay its debt.

Competition. College leaders must recognize that fund raising is very competitive. The average corporation gives less than two percent of its net annual income to charity of all types. The presumption that the capacity to give is automatically increased by the profitability of a corporation is simply not valid. A community college is competing for a share of a small pie that rises slowly and has many claimants.

Specific Preferences. Corporations have strong preferences for specific charities. Each operates under sets of preferences of its directors, employees, executives, and shareholders. Corporations often give to enhance loyalty by consumers, to enhance corporate image, and to participate in the welfare of the communities in which they are located or want to do business. It helps for a college to link its request for funds to a strong business interest. A case needs to be made that the existence of the college results in specific benefits to the corporation.

Necessary Approvals. In the final analysis, corporate assets belong to shareholders. They are not any corporate officer's to give. It is helpful to appreciate that the person to whom a request is directed usually cannot make the decision alone. The case made to the corporate contact must be persuasive at every level that the appeal travels, and college leaders must be prepared to help their corporate contacts to sell the case for giving to the college to internal decision makers.

Tax Benefits. For most corporations, the actual tax benefit from making the typical contribution may be small unless it is a major type of research equipment given to a college for educational purposes. Furthermore, there are some types of gifts that cannot be deducted and some types of property that can only bring a very low, if any, tax deduction. Some assets are better being disposed of in discount sales rather than given away. Therefore, any appeal should not rest solely on so called tax write offs. Tax benefits are important, but not as important as the clarity of a college's mission and usefulness to the community. While it is useful to be well informed about tax law related to corporate giving, it is even more important to understand the limited appeal of arguments based upon this rationale.

Fiduciary Responsibility. Savvy corporate donors are more impressed by well presented balance sheets and revenue and expense statements than they are by budgets. Budgets tell the corporate donor something about the ambition of the college and what it proposes to do with its gift. However, financial statements reveal much more about a college's actual performance and track record. Corporate donors want to know whether a college is capable and can be trusted to complete successfully any project for which it seeks funding. They will not invest in a college that has a bad financial record.

Documentation. Colleges should be prepared to document that they are truly tax exempt and in good standing with the IRS and the state. Corporations may also request proof that the college is a qualified donee, a 501 (c) (3) organization in good standing. Such documentation is needed to support deductibility of their gifts. In addition, the corporation may ask a donee to warrant that its gift would be used strictly for educational purposes. This too is needed to permit favorable treatment as a business deduction. This warrant will also protect the college from having to pay taxes on earnings associated with the gift.

Patience. Corporate giving, except in extraordinary situations such as disasters, comes from patience and nurturing. Emotional appeals are usually unproductive and distracting to what is essentially a business decision. Patience and grace are more likely to be rewarded.

Appropriate Channels. Most corporations give through a corporate foundation. These foundations are normally required to make certain levels of contributions every year so as to maintain their status. They are also the primary source of information about the types of programs that interest the corporation. Development professionals should always obtain a copy of the annual report of the corporate foundation and read it thoroughly. Any appeal for corporate giving should be carefully tailored to the guidelines of its foundation and informed by its report of past activities and preferences.

Employee Influence. Corporations often make gifts in response to employee initiative and interest. Some are in the form of matching gifts. It is important not to underestimate the influence that employees can have. In fact, many successful appeals are not initiated with corporate officers but at other employee levels. A college can enhance its contacts with a corporation in a number of ways, including having a corporate employee serve as a college faculty member or administrator. Such a link can prove invaluable to a successful request for funds.

Stewardship. Once a gift is made, it is absolutely critical that the college exercise good stewardship in its use, especially if the college hopes to seek additional funds from the corporation or its corporate associates for other purposes. No corporation wants to be embarrassed or disappointed. The college must deliver on any promises associated with the gift, routinely report to the donor how its gift is being used, and document the specific outcomes of the gift.

Implementing a Corporate Giving Campaign

With these guidelines in mind, colleges should approach corporate giving as it would any other ambitious project. Goals need to be established, a target group of corporations needs to be identified, strategies for gaining access to corporations on the list need to be formulated, staff must be selected and trained, and resources need to be set aside to implement the plan. However, a corporate fund raising campaign involves a lot more than sending out mail solicitations. Most involve the college president and put the prestige of both the institution and the person on the line. The following steps can help a college president succeed in such an effort:

1. Prime the targeted corporation by sending a speech, a brochure, newspaper clippings, a catalog, or some other documentation of what the college does. Follow up with contacts met at civic events by sending college material or an invitation to visit the campus.
2. Know everything about the college. Be prepared to answer any question a corporate contact may have. Develop a list of programs and activities that might appeal to the donative instincts of the corporation.
3. Develop a set of specific selling points about the college. None may eventually prevail, but they help begin a productive conversation. The key is to avoid pushing points too hard; do not foreclose the discussion of different ideas that a corporate contact may have.

4. Become familiar with alternative ways of giving and the different assets a corporation may give to fund specific college priorities. The implications of giving inventory instead of cash or stock are quite different, but it is important not to lose a sale by being unprepared to counter any offer.

5. Learn about the corporation. Read the corporation's annual report and find out if it already has some connection to the college. Show sincere interest in the company's business, personalities, and problems as a means of establishing rapport with its representatives.

None of these strategies can guarantee a successful corporate giving campaign, but all will greatly increase a college's and president's chances of success.

Community colleges have probably never been so well positioned to succeed in raising needed funds from corporate gifts. For the first time, individuals who have attended community colleges are emerging in responsible positions in corporations. Even more important, community colleges are increasingly providing workforce training to employees of local business and industry and assisting communities with economic development. These efforts help make the most important case for community colleges: they are vital to the health and prosperity of their communities, and to the businesses that serve and are supported by them.

Herrington J. Bryce is Life of Virginia Professor of Business Administration, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. This abstract is drawn from his highly acclaimed book, Financial and Strategic Management for Nonprofit Organizations, recently published in its 2nd edition by Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632.

Leadership Abstracts September 1993 Volume 6, Number 9

League for Innovation in the Community College

VOCATIONAL AND GENERAL EDUCATION: NEW RELATIONSHIP OR SHOTGUN MARRIAGE?

James Jacobs

There is general agreement among community college educators on the importance of developing better linkages between vocational and academic education. External forces have effectively required better integration of the two once□separate domains. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1990, the major federal legislation that defines and organizes vocational education, actually mandates that all states measure vocational students' progress in achieving both basic and advanced academic skills. Perhaps an even more important force for change has been the changing skill needs of American business and industry.

Workplace Skills Needed in the New Era

In the past decade, higher education has increasingly been called upon to serve the needs of business and industry, primarily by providing needed employee training. This is not a new development, as colleges and universities have responded to calls for closer ties to the world of work since the mid□nineteenth century. What is new this time is the provision of training for those already employed by business and industry as well as for new entrants into the work force. Also new to the discussion is the realization that not only has the absolute magnitude of employee skills deficits and the corresponding need for education and training increased, but so too has the qualitative nature of the skills needed by a rapidly changing economy.

Essentially, the technological base of American industry has changed dramatically, and these changes--nearly all in the direction of greater complexity and interdependence-□require workers who possess not only higher levels of basic skills but also new skills in critical thinking, problem solving, initiative, and collaboration. Not only does the manufacturing sector require workers who can read, write, cipher, and operate complex, computer□controlled machinery, but also workers who understand the interrelationship of manufacturing processes and who can respond to problems involving systems outside of their immediate areas of responsibility.

The fast□paced development of new technologies has forced business and industry to invest heavily in retraining its present work force. Community colleges throughout the nation have responded by providing training and education customized to meet the specific needs of local employers. This growth of customized training has challenged traditional notions of vocational education by focusing on adult workers, who possess a range of job skills and life experiences. Conventional vocational programs were designed for youth entering the work force, and most were aimed at providing specific job□related technical skills.

However, the distinction between training and education has blurred as business and industry demand both job□specific training and general skills that can be applied in a variety of technical areas. Trends in the workplace have forced colleges to consider carefully how they might successfully integrate general education with vocational training.

Principles for Integrating Education and Training

The following are principles to guide the integration of general education into vocational curricula.

Critical Thinking. First, the critical thinking skills that come from the general education curriculum are central to the successful implementation of new technologies. Course components need to deal with problems of implementing technologies, as well as with the skills associated with operating them. The example of computer□automated design (CAD) is illustrative. The conventional vocational program teaches skills that permit an individual to operate a piece of equipment or set of interrelated equipment. For instance, one can learn to be a CAD operator at most community colleges and develop sufficient skills to perform most two□dimensional drawings. However, if a firm is to realize significant productivity gains from CAD, workers must have an understanding of how the process can be applied to making libraries of parts, to storing and manipulating CAD□generated information, and to passing those data to other machines such as cutting tools. These needs make it incumbent that the CAD operator understands how the technology fits within the production strategy of the firm, a topic that too few CAD courses now cover.

Basic Skills. Second, instruction in basic skills needs to be part of any vocational education program. New manufacturing technologies call for more attention to the use of basic skills to compute, deduce, and communicate answers to problems. Teaching in many vocational education classes is based on repetition and observation of others, and this can be effective for training job□specific skills. However, such instruction needs to

be coupled with teaching strategies that have been proven effective in helping students develop basic skills. Subjects such as mathematics and communications should not be segregated from vocational education programs but need to be designed as core components of any vocational curriculum. Instructional strategies need to be appropriate to the intended learning outcomes.

Learning to Learn. The ability to grow and change is increasingly required in the workplace. Transferable skills are especially important because the applications of new manufacturing technologies to particular problems are extremely diverse. For instance, there is no one way to implement computer numerical control. In some firms, the programming of the machine is undertaken by the engineering department, far removed from the shop floor. In others, program adjustments are made by the operator of the equipment. For firms to realize the flexibility that computer□based technologies can bring to the workplace, workers need both broad general skills and the ability to learn and apply their skills to a variety of contexts in the workplace.

In 1985, the Committee for Economic Development, a national association of business groups, foreshadowed current criticism of conventional models of vocational education: "Business in general is not interested in narrow vocationalism... Employers would prefer a curriculum that stresses literacy, mathematical skills, and problem□solving skills; one that emphasizes learn-ing how to learn and adapting to change."

Ability to Adapt to Job Changes. Workers must be able to integrate basic skills with the shifts in workplace and market demands. New manufacturing technologies decrease the

amount of direct labor involved in manufacturing, but they raise the demand for associated work. The repair and maintenance function, for example, becomes more critical, and many tasks related to software development, positioning of machine vision systems, and quality control of operations have become more important. All of these tasks are performed by skilled workers, often those upgraded from production work. The challenge to vocational educators is to develop programs that train workers in the skills necessary to advance along the "labor queue." Career advancement requires workers to be able to apply their skills to a variety of tasks and to learn new jobs as they emerge in the workplace. Such adaptability needs to be an outcome of all community college vocational programs.

Updating of Vocational Faculty. Community college vocational faculty need to relearn and update their own knowledge and skills. New manufacturing technologies challenge vocational educators not only to update their equipment, but also to update their faculty. Most com-munity colleges' vocational faculty received their training in the premicrocomputer era, and unless adequate staff development programs have been provided, they have probably lagged behind the development of technology.

Equally significant, faculty tend to approach techni-cal training as one would teach skills to inexperienced youth. However, training that might be appropriate for an eighteen year□old just out of high school and looking for a trade is often unsuitable for adults in their midthirties, most of whom already have jobs and attend class in the evenings. These learners each have a work history, family, and context around which good technical train-ing must be built. In short, adult students need to be taught in a style that can draw

upon their skills, and colleges need to develop the teaching skills of their vocational faculty to deal more effectively with adults.

Higher□Level Decision Making Skills. Workers need to expand their skills to include information gathering, analytical and critical thinking, and decision making. The introduction of new technology is associated with the broader issue of organizational change. Corpora-tions are moving away from an era of mass production to one of specialization and marketing. Thus, the principal strength of a business organization is not the ability to realize economies of scale and produce cheaper goods than its competitors, but rather skill in recognizing trends in the market and quickly responding with targeted products and services. For example, a successful automobile company does not design cars for the general American family but rather, based on marketing information, for different segments of that family. The reason that Japanese automobile makers have done so well in the United States is not because their costs are lower but because they have geared their production strategies to make quick product adjustments to meet changing consumer tastes.

This emphasis on flexibility and quick responses to the marketplace alters the skills necessary for success, Information gathering, analytical and critical thinking skills, and decision making take on heightened impor-tance, not only for the top management of the company but for all levels of the organization. Indeed, successful firms build less hierarchical organizations and strive to bring decision making close to the production process. The skills that are necessary to provide leadership for the company are the same as those needed on the shop floor. Not only are higher levels of work skills required, but

such skills are the outcome of a general education more than of narrow vocational training.

Vocational education in the nation's schools and colleges is undergoing a major transformation. As process skills become more critical in the workplace than job specific knowledge, vocational educators are being forced to seek ways to integrate general education into their programs. The result will be workers with higher skills, paid higher wages, and able to compete in the global economy. The challenge for community colleges is to redesign their vocational programs, drawing upon their expertise in general education, to respond to the changing needs of the American workplace.

James Jacobs is director of policy research at Macomb County Community College, Warren, Michigan, and former senior researcher for the Industrial Technology Institute, Ann Arbor. This piece is abstracted from an article of the same name in New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 81, Spring 1993, published by Jossey□Bass.

Leadership Abstracts October 1993 Volume 6, Number 10

League for Innovation in the Community College

WHAT PRESIDENTS NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE IMPACT OF NETWORKING

from the Higher Education Information Resources Alliance

Since ubiquitous voice, data, and video networking appeared on the Drake University campus in 1987, the new mechanisms for communication have triggered a change in the daily rhythm of that university. Electronic-mail and voice mail systems allow faculty and staff to receive messages at all hours of the day and night, in the office, at home, or on the road messages to which they can respond at their convenience. A campuswide video distribution system creates a similar store and forward environment for the video world. The president encourages incoming freshmen to use his e mail address and maintains many of his widespread contacts with other members of the campus community by e mail with capability for attaching word processing documents, spreadsheets, and other files.

Drake is one of many colleges and universities that are undergoing cultural changes as a result of extensive electronic connections. Within the last decade, computers that once operated in isolation have taken on new power and popularity as networked devices. Local area networks link large portions of most campuses, and national networks have evolved from specialized services for researchers in computer related disciplines to general utilities on many campuses.

In a networked environment, users have access to a range of resources that was almost unimaginable even five years ago. Campuswide systems bring together information from all over the campus and its neighboring communities academic and administrative records, library data bases, calendars of events, job postings, and weather reports and increasingly support access to

external sources of information through the Internet and BITNET. The ramifications for higher education are enormous in instruction, in library operations, in administration, and in community service.

Impact of Networks on Instruction

The core mission of colleges and universities is learning. Networked information technologies, from simple e mail to sophisticated linked multimedia classrooms, have the potential to foster a student centered learning environment in which students can customize the learning process to their needs and faculty can work more like coaches than lecturers.

Open Classrooms. Computer conferencing and electronic mail allow students to communicate with instructors and with each other around the clock, allowing a new freedom of discussion, questioning, and clarification even in large classes. With networked communication, the classroom is always open.

Customized Personalized Learning. Interactive multimedia instructional software allows students to replay learning segments and explore new subjects at a depth appropriate to their own needs. New networked technologies also serve the specialized physical needs of students and faculty with disabilities. In the face of growing demands for remedial help, instructional software can ease pressures on staff by offering self-paced, self directed resources. The use of live databases and real time simulation and gaming brings a new level of immediacy and relevance to the learning process.

Distance Education. Communication with a growing population of distant or homebound learners and faculty can be maintained through a variety of formats, including voice, data, video, and integrated media. By combining elements of personal computers, digital television, and electronic libraries through multimedia servers and network based delivery systems, colleges and

universities can loosen the rigidity of the class schedule, relieving space pressures and accommodating complex schedules of the nontraditional student.

Collaboration. Colleges and universities can leverage resources by collaborating. At the University of Guelph, for example, an interactive audiovisual link connects classrooms to the University of Waterloo for joint graduate programs in chemistry and physics and will soon be expanded to include McMaster University.

Libraries as Networked Resources

Networking has created an emphasis on access to information rather than acquisition of it. Although the college library is still the most significant campus repository of information, its resources will increasingly be viewed as a network resource. Larger percentages of library holdings are available in digital form, from secondary bibliographic resources to the texts themselves.

The library of the future can be conceptualized as a collection of virtual libraries through which the resources of many libraries, information services, and knowledge stores are brought together technologically. Such a library can be tailored for the specific needs of each academic department or even individual faculty members through a variety of networks and workstation environments.

Developing network access to this complex world of information requires the combined skills of faculty, research librarians, and information technology administrators to manage its electronic collection, structuring, representation, and dissemination. As a result, the library is becoming a major force in setting campuswide strategies for networked resources.

Distributed, Networked Administrative Resources

The computing and information environment of the future is distributed. Information resources will be located where they are most logically created or maintained, and users will access most information from their workstations. This means that institutional data can be keyed once and maintained by a data owner but accessed by any member of the campus community with the need and authorization.

Campuswide networks support a growing array of administrative and business applications, from executive information systems to electronic forms and transcripts. Student charge account systems can track telephone and photocopy charges, purchases from soft drink machines, and costs of custom published books from the electronic library. The network can replace the mailing of physical stacks of paper while decreasing the time for distribution to virtually nothing, guaranteeing delivery at rates approaching 100 percent, and reducing costs drastically.

The result of a good network design is efficiency, reliability, timeliness, and ease of access. The prerequisite is strong centralized management uniform technical standards, security precautions, ongoing funding, and continual user training and support.

Impact on Both Internal and External Community

Perhaps the greatest impact that networks have had on colleges and universities has been in interpersonal communications. Networks allow users to communicate inexpensively, unconstrained by time or distance. On campus, geographical and cultural barriers between units are being broken down by the ease and cultural neutrality afforded by networked communication. Networks have a particular impact on the sense of community, especially at large, dispersed institutions A campus provost for the 57,000 student St. Petersburg Junior

College observes that "The computer has pulled us all closer together. There is more of a community feeling now."

Networks are allowing colleges and universities to offer significant services to their communities as relatively painless extensions of their services to campus constituencies. Case Western Reserve University is pioneering information service to its broader community through Cleveland Free Net. The seven year old network offers over 300 information services to 40,000 registered users at a cost to CWRU of less than $200,000. Many colleges and universities offer network resources and support to local K 12 school systems, collaborative professional training by distance education, and shared library databases thus projecting the image they want of a high tech, contributing neighbor.

Rising Expectations and New Issues

The ubiquity of desktop computers and the proliferation of networks and useful networked information has changed not only the character of institutions, but also the expectations of students, faculty, and staff. Users are no longer content with slow file transfer rates. Librarians and computing center personnel are swamped with demands for help accessing the wealth of information available on campus and worldwide networks. Installing, maintaining, and supporting networks have become a larger part of support staff workload.

As more users come on line, system administrators must deal with knotty issues of security and access, information indexing and retrieval, filtering useful information, selecting hardware and software standards, and determining sources of funding. Not the least of the administrator's problems is the decentralized nature of higher education communities. With extensive networking, all units lose some of their autonomy because everything connects to everything else. Record keeping and information retrieval must conform to public needs, and

previously independent units find themselves linked in unexpected ways. Also, while computer centers have been the organizational home of data and communications services, the advance of networks including voice and video communications, telemetry, and other decentralized computing facilities will probably require major administrative reorganization in most institutions.

However, the single most important factor for the success of a networked campus environment is a consensus vision that is meaningful to the faculty, staff, and students. This vision provides direction and substance to the endeavor and it must be maintained by a highly placed champion with recognized authority.

At a time when higher education executives are being pressed to reduce administrative costs, networks are providing additional capabilities and efficiencies. Investment in networked information resources can improve the productivity of faculty, staff, and students, and the quality of instruction, research, and administration. It can position the institution to thrive in the decades ahead. While there is no way to predict where the evolution of information technology will lead higher education, change is certain to be extensive, expensive, and inevitable.

This piece is abstracted from the HEIR Alliance Executive Strategies Report #3. The Executive Strategies reports are published by the Higher Education Information Resources Alliance, a vehicle for cooperative projects among the Association of Research Libraries, CAUSE, and EDUCOM. For more information about this series of reports on critical issues in information technology for campus executives, contact editor Karen McBride at CAUSE, 4840 Pearl East Circle, Suite 302E ' Boulder, Colorado 80301; (303) 449 4430, kmcbride@CAUSE.colorado.edu.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").